IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Crl. Misc. No.52382-M of 2006
Date of decision: February 6, 2007.

Satish Kumar

...**Petitioner(s)**

v.

State of Haryana & Anr.

...**Respondent(s)**

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA KANT

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest.

Present: Shri Gurinderjit Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Shri Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

## ORDER

The petitioner, who is a life convict, is aggrieved at the order dated 26.7.2006 (Annexure P3) passed by the Director General of Prisons, Haryana denying him parole for agricultural operations on the ground that the land measuring 1.5 acres is being cultivated by his parents who are alive and who are capable to take care of the said land.

Somewhat similar stand has been taken in the written statement also.

Having regard to the small size of the land holding, the view taken by the authorities hardly requires any interference by this Court.

However, relying upon a report purported to have been issued by the Sarpanch of the Gram Panchayat (Annexure P1), Learned Counsel for the petitioner contends that the father of the petitioner may not be alive and as such except his old mother and wife, there is no one to look after the land as the petitioner's children are minor.

If that is so, liberty is granted to the petitioner to again apply

for the parole for agricultural operations along with supporting material and if any such application is moved by him, the respondent-authorities are directed to reconsider the same in accordance with law within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

Disposed of.

February 6, 2007. [ **Surya Kant** ]
*kadyan* **Judge**